

# Request for Offers (RFO) Addendum

RFO Number: RFO0036

Addendum Number: 1

Date of Addendum: 03/13/2015

Original Due Date, Time: 03/19/2015, 4:00PM CT

Revised Date, Time (if changing): N/A

Title: Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) Licensing Systems Analysis

## SCOPE OF ADDENDUM

The following are changes to the RFO:

**#1 Revising the Submission Format Section** (In this Addendum, changes to pre-existing RFO language will use strike through for deletions and underlining for insertions.)

### Submission Format

The proposal should be assembled as follows:

1. **Cover Page**
  - Vendor Name
  - Vendor Address
  - Vendor City, State, Zip
  - Contact Name for Vendor
  - Contact's direct phone/cell phone (if applicable)
  - Contact's email
  - Resource Name being submitted
- Introduction
- Company overview
  - a) Company history, growth
  - b) Current financial data if publicly available
- Three client references
- Project Overview
- Detailed response to "Project Requirements"
  - a) Description of the vendors' understanding of the need and explanation of their proposed solution for completing the work as outlined in the "Project Deliverables" section of this document.
  - b) List any project requirements you cannot meet and explain why they cannot be met.
- Project Approach
  - 1) Organization and staffing
  - 2) Draft work plan
  - 3) Contract/change management procedures
  - 4) Project management
  - 5) Documentation of progress such as status reports
- A preliminary work plan describing high-level deliverables, identifying responsible staff, ~~and~~ a timetable for delivery, and a cost breakdown (estimated number of hours and proposed hourly rate) for each deliverable

### #2 Posting Questions Received and Answers

- 1) I currently support McKinley's partnership with the SITE program. After review the requirements for the

RFO0036, I have a question on the proposal requirements. Where it states:

- ☐ Detailed response to "Project Requirements"

a) Description of the vendors' understanding of the need and explanation of their proposed solution for completing the work as outlined in the "Project Deliverables" section of this document.

Is this part of the written requirement for the submission? I just want to be sure our proposal is accurate. Thank you!

**ANSWER:** Yes, this is part of the submission.

2) I'm new to the SITE program so I just wanted to make sure these are IT Staff Augmentation positions? The RFO reads more like a fixed bid request because it asks in the submissions to include:

1. Project Overview
2. Project Requirements
3. Project Approach
4. Work Plan

Is this possibly a mistake and you really just want the resumes with references for the individual submittals?

**ANSWER:** This is a fix bid and the items 1-4 are required.

3) Where can I access the bill rates for each position?

**ANSWER:** Vendors must submit proposed costs with their responses. The maximum rate a vendor can charge by category can be found at <http://mn.gov/buyit/14atm/main.html>

4) There are 3 different divisions and 22 areas under those divisions. How many different licensing systems are there across these 22 areas? Is it a separate system per division or per area?

**ANSWER:** The areas are combined into a few different systems. For example, most of Environmental Health is in one system currently. Health regulation is a few of systems, and Health policy is one system.

5) If there are shared licensing systems, how many different workflows need to be analyzed under those systems? (Is there overlap among different areas of Environmental Health for example?)

**ANSWER:** Don't know, that is what this analysis is going to determine. However, as mentioned above there is overlap among the work flow for Environmental Health since a lot of the areas are in one system.

6) Can you estimate how many SMEs and IT Support Staff should be interviewed or talked to about the different licensing systems?

**ANSWER:** You would be talking with the 3 IT Supervisors and 6-7 of the Business Unit supervisors. Those individuals would determine what other staff need to be brought into the discussions. I don't have an exact count.

7) Does current state documentation exist for the licensing systems?

**ANSWER:** Some does exist.

- 8) Is there a desired future state or any known future state limitations? (Can these all become one licensing system or will multiple systems still be required?)

**ANSWER:** The work done by the Business Analysis will help us determine if they can all become one system or need to be separate. As stated in the RFO we are trying to determine how much the Licensing processes have in common and how many gaps there are.

- 9) Among three divisions (Environmental Health, Health Regulations, and Health Policy Systems), how many SMEs are involved in the project?

**ANSWER:** 3 IT Supervisors and probably around 6 or 7 Business Unit leaders. Of course they will probably bring in some of their staff as well.

- 10) Will all of the SMEs be available to the IT Business Analyst?

**ANSWER:** Yes.

- 11) Are all of the SMEs available within one location?

**ANSWER:** 2 locations, Orville Freeman Building and Golden Rule Building

- 12) Is MDH looking for Fixed Bid or Time and Material based cost proposal?

**ANSWER:** Fix bid.

- 13) Can vendor assign two (2) resources (IT Business Analyst) to this project?

**ANSWER:** Yes.

- 14) Will the MDH please offer more detail as to the experience that will satisfy the requirement that the analyst or analysts have "at least 2 years working with Health regulation, certification and licensing systems"?

**ANSWER:** Someone who has worked on systems that do regulation, certification, and licensing of various entities related to Health such as the areas listed under "Preliminary Scope" in the RFO.

- 15) The RFO specifies an IT Business Analyst in the singular tense. Will MDH consider a team approach with more than one analyst?

**ANSWER:** Yes

- 16) If the MDH will allow a team approach, must all team members meet the "Required Skills" on page 4 of the RFO or will the proposal be considered if the prime team member meets them but not necessarily all other team members?

**ANSWER:** Yes

- 17) Will the MDH please confirm that the term "make" in the following sentence should be re-worded to say "making": "Demonstrated experience in understanding the State's business systems and make recommendations on solutions that most effectively addresses the needs of the business."?

**ANSWER:** Confirmed.

**18)** Does the MDH have a not to exceed amount cost for this opportunity?

**ANSWER:** Yes.

**19)** How is the preliminary work plan describing high level deliverables, staff and timeline differ from the draft work plan under Project Approach (Section: Submission Format)?

**ANSWER:** Project Approach should explain how you are going to go about executing on 1-4, (e.g. what is your methodology for approaching the project). The preliminary work plan is the actual plan for doing the work.

**20)** Irrespective of the fact that we were not registered as a “resident vendor” when the initial submission was made, we can now qualify in light of the fact that we are now registered, and are in good standing dating back to February 20, 2014. Therefore do we fill out the “Vendor Resident Form?”

**ANSWER: Resident Vendor:**

The resident vendor form is currently handled within each solicitation made under the SITE program. In accordance with Laws of Minnesota 2013, Chapter 142, Article 3, Section 16, amending Minn. Stat. § 16C.02, subd. 13, a “Resident Vendor” means a person, firm, or corporation that:

- (1) is authorized to conduct business in the state of Minnesota on the date a solicitation for a contract is first advertised or announced. It includes a foreign corporation duly authorized to engage in business in Minnesota;
- (2) has paid unemployment taxes or income taxes in this state during the 12 calendar months immediately preceding submission of the bid or proposal for which any preference is sought;
- (3) has a business address in the state; and
- (4) has affirmatively claimed that status in the bid or proposal submission.

To receive recognition as a Minnesota Resident Vendor (“Resident Vendor”), your company must meet each element of the statutory definition above by the solicitation opening date and time. If you wish to affirmatively claim Resident Vendor status, you should do so by submitting the form located at <http://www.mmd.admin.state.mn.us/doc/residentvendorform.doc> with your bid or proposal.

**21)** Submission Format – 3. Conflict of Interest Statement

The RFO submission format asks for a Conflict of Interest Statement as it relates to this project. Does the state have a standard form to utilize for this purpose? Or should we just repeat the language in contained in the Conflict of Interest section in the General Requirements

**ANSWER: Conflicts of Interest:**

There is not a standard form or format for the required Conflict of Interest statement. You may repeat the pertinent language that is contained in the Conflicts of Interest section under the General Requirements of the RFO within your response to the solicitation

**22)** RFO Evaluation Process – Will the state provide the vendors submitting responses to the RFO(s) the scoring results of the Evaluation Process for all vendors. Please provide an example of how the RFO Evaluation Process scoring will be calculated.

**ANSWER:** As identified in the RFO, the evaluation process is:

RFO Evaluation Process

- Company (5%)
- Experience (30%)
- Three client references (5%)
- Work Plan (20%)
- Cost (30%)
- Additional Knowledge (10%)

Based on the high volume of the program, this information is not routinely released.

**23)** Will the award of the project associated with RFO 0036 for MDH Licensing Systems Analysis exclude the selected Vendor from participating in the delivery of consulting services, systems integration services and/or software development services that will result from the scope definition, system functionality and workflow documentation, gap analysis, recommendations and final report provided in the performance of RFO 0036.

**ANSWER:** I believe so.

This addendum shall become part of the RFO and should be returned with, or acknowledged in, the response to the RFO.

RESPONDER NAME:

SIGNATURE:

TITLE:

DATE: